

# **EXHIBIT 7**

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

Page 1

1 COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

2 MADISON COUNTY, OHIO

3 \* \* \*

4  
5 STATE OF OHIO, ex rel.

Dave Yost, in his capacity

6 as Attorney General of Ohio,

7 Plaintiff,

8  
9 vs. CASE NO. CVH20180055

10 McKESSON CORPORATION, et al.,

11 Defendants.

12 \* \* \*

13  
14 VOLUME I

15 Videotaped Deposition of

16 JOSEPH RANNAZZISI, a witness herein, called by

17 the defendants for examination pursuant to the

18 Rules of Civil Procedure, taken before me,

19 Patti Stachler, RMR, CRR, a Notary Public

20 within and for the State of Ohio, in Annandale,

21 Virginia, on July 16, 2020, at 9:21 a.m.

22 \* \* \*

23 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

Page 40

1 one more example. Can we -- can you open  
2 tab 49?

3 A. 49.

4 Q. Yes, please. When did you  
5 start -- before you open that, sir, when did  
6 you start working on the Ohio lawsuit?

7 A. Sometime in 2017.

8 Q. 2017. Okay. Do you mind looking  
9 at tab 49? And I'll mark it for the record as  
10 Exhibit 49.

11 A. Okay.

12 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 49 as a  
13 profile that in this case Ms. Carter wrote for  
14 you for Berry Pharmacy Company?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. In New Richmond, Ohio?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And let's look at the metadata for  
19 this. You can look at the last page. We'll  
20 put it up on the screen as well. Do you see  
21 that the properties for this list Ruth Carter  
22 as the author?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And do you see that they don't  
25 list Ruth Carter generically like the prior one

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

Page 190

1 following the law, the requirements under the  
2 statute and the requirements under the  
3 regulations. And that's all I ever requested.

4 So nothing is good enough because  
5 all I ever see are violations. And, like I  
6 said, I'm sure there are people out there that  
7 are following the law and I never get to see  
8 them because they're following the law.

9 BY MR. SCHMIDT:

10 Q. Okay. Just tell me one. Prove me  
11 wrong by telling me one distributor who you  
12 would say, that's what a suspicious order  
13 monitoring program is supposed to look like and  
14 how it's supposed to be implemented; just one,  
15 please.

16 A. I cannot tell you that because I  
17 don't know all the suspicious order monitor  
18 programs of all the distributors in the United  
19 States. All I know is the ones that came  
20 forward with the violations that we took action  
21 against.

22 Q. Okay. Do you -- when you left  
23 DEA, you left under a cloud, right?

24 A. No. I didn't leave under --

25 Q. There was a -- was there a pending

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

Page 191

1 Office of Inspector General investigation  
2 against you?

3 A. There was -- well --

4 Q. Yes or no?

5 A. There was a pending Office of  
6 Inspector General investigation concerning  
7 the -- I guess the allegation was I was  
8 intimidating Congress.

9 Q. Right. So is the answer to my  
10 question, yes, at the time you left there was a  
11 pending Office of Inspector General  
12 investigation against you for misconduct?

13 MR. UTTER: Objection.

14 A. That's not misconduct. And it was  
15 an allegation concerning a phone call. And --  
16 that we presented an issue, we presented a  
17 series of problems with a certain piece of  
18 legislation, and they didn't like the way we  
19 presented it.

20 BY MR. SCHMIDT:

21 Q. Let me ask you as simply as I can  
22 because I don't want to quibble with you. I  
23 just want to focus on facts. Are you aware  
24 that a letter was sent to the Office of the  
25 Inspector General from United States